



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

Q137-US2

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Typed or printed  
name \_\_\_\_\_Application Number  
10/666,861Filed  
September 17, 2003First Named Inventor  
Hisashi Tsukamoto et al.Art Unit  
1745Examiner  
Dah Wei D. Yuan

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified patent application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)☒ attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number 42,491☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Travis Dodd  
Typed or printed name818-833-2003  
Telephone number06/14/2007  
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☒ \*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 37 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



PATENT  
Docket No. Q137-US2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Hisashi Tsukamoto et al.

Serial No: 10/666,861

Filed: September 17, 2003

For: ELECTRIC STORAGE BATTERY  
CONSTRUCTION AND METHOD OF  
MANUFACTURE

Art Unit: 1745

Examiner: YUAN, Dah Wei D.

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review**

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 13, 2006 (the Office Action). Pending claims 1-9 and 66-71 are rejected for statutory double patenting. The Applicant submits that a clear legal error has been committed in rejecting claims 1-9 and 66-71 for statutory double patenting.

**REMARKS**

**A. The Pending Claims**

Claims 1-9 and 66-71 are pending. Claim 1 is the only independent claim pending in the current application. Claim 1 specifies an electric storage battery. The battery includes an electrode assembly in the interior volume of a case. In addition to other limitations, the electrode assembly includes an elongate pin and an elongate mandrel fitted around the pin.

Claim 67 is also at issue in the current application. Claim 67 specifies that "the mandrel includes a tube." Since claim 67 depends from claim 1, claim 67 specifies that "the mandrel includes a tube" and is "fitted around the pin."

Claim 68 is also at issue in the current application. Claim 68 depends from claim 67 which specifies that "the mandrel includes a tube." Claim 68 then specifies that "the pin is positioned in an interior of the tube." Since claim 68 indirectly depends from claim 1, claim

68 specifies that the mandrel “includes a tube” and is “fitted around the pin” with “the pin positioned in (the) interior of the tube”.

### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC §101**

Claims 1-9 and 66-71 stand rejected under 35 USC §101 for double patenting in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,071 B2 (Skinlo). This rejection is for statutory double patenting as opposed to nonstatutory double patenting. Accordingly, this rejection requires that the claims are to the same invention.

### **CLAIMS 1-9 AND 69-71**

Skinlo has only one Independent Claim which specifies a “mandrel closely fitted around said pin **for mechanically reinforcing said pin**” (emphasis added). In contrast, Claims 1-9 and 69-71 of this application requires a mandrel “fitted around the pin” but do not specify that the mandrel is for mechanically reinforcing the pin. Since the statutory double patenting rejection requires that the conflicting claims are for the same invention, the Office Action argument that claims 1-9 and 69-71 of the current application claims the same invention of Skinlo is a statement that any mandrel “fitted around a pin” is necessarily “for mechanically reinforcing said pin” as required by claim 1 of Skinlo. As a result, the Office Action is asserting that any possible mandrel “fitted around a pin” falls within the scope of the Skinlo claim language of a “mandrel closely fitted around said pin for mechanically reinforcing said pin.”

Since Skinlo includes limitations that are not present in the claims of the current Application, claims 1-9 and 69-71 of the current application each have a different scope than each of the claims in Skinlo and the rejection of claims 1-9 and 69-71 for statutory double-patenting should be withdrawn.

### **CLAIM 66**

Claim 66 of the current application specifies that a crimp connects the mandrel to the pin. None of the Skinlo claims includes this limitation. However, claim 8 of Skinlo does specify that “said mandrel is welded to said pin.” In order to retain the double patenting

rejection of claim 66, the Office Action states “the weld that connects the mandrel to the pin is considered as a crimp that connects the mandrel to the pin.”

As set forth in MPEP 2111, claim terms cannot be given an interpretation that is inconsistent with the specification. Interpreting a weld to be the same as a crimp contradicts the current specification. Note that the first 3 lines on page 3 of the current application include the following language:

The mandrel 48, pin 12, and substrate 32 are then preferably welded together, such as by resistance spot welding or by ultrasonic welding.

**Alternatively**, the mandrel 48 may be crimped onto the pin 12....

The specification’s use of the term “alternatively” teaches that crimping is an alternative to welding. Hence, the specification teaches that a weld and a crimp are not the same but are alternatives. Since the specification teaches that a crimp is different from a weld, the interpretation relied upon in support of this rejection contradicts the specification and is not proper.

Since claim 66 includes limitations that are not present in the claims of the Skinlo Application, claim 66 of the current application has a different scope than each of the claims in Skinlo and the rejection of claim 66 for statutory double-patenting should be withdrawn.

## **CLAIM 67**

The Office Action also cites claim 67 in responding to Applicant’s arguments. As a result, the Office Action appears to indicate that claim 67 conflicts with the claims of Skinlo. As noted above, Claim 67 specifies that “the mandrel includes a tube” and is “fitted around the pin.” However, claim 67 does not specify that the mandrel is for mechanically reinforcing the pin as required by claim 1 of Skinlo. Since a statutory double patenting rejection requires that the conflicting claims are for the same invention, the Office Action argument that claim 67 of the current application claims the same invention as Skinlo is a statement that any mandrel that “includes a tube” and is “fitted around a pin” is necessarily “for mechanically reinforcing said pin” as required by claim 1 of Skinlo. As a result, the Office Action is asserting that any possible mandrel that “includes a tube” and is “fitted around a pin” falls within the scope of the Skinlo claim language of a “mandrel closely fitted around said pin for mechanically reinforcing said pin.”

Since Skinlo includes limitations that are not present in the claim 67 of the current application, claim 67 of the current application has a different scope than each of the claims in Skinlo and the rejection of claim 67 for statutory double-patenting should be withdrawn.

#### **CLAIM 68**

The Office Action also cites claim 68 in responding to Applicant's arguments. As a result, the Office Action appears to indicate that claim 68 conflicts with the claims of Skinlo. As noted above, Claim 68 specifies that the mandrel "includes a tube" and is "fitted around the pin" with "the pin positioned in (the) interior of the tube." However, claim 68 does not specify that the mandrel is for mechanically reinforcing the pin as required by claim 1 of Skinlo. Since a statutory double patenting rejection requires that the conflicting claims are for the same invention, the Office Action argument that claim 68 of the current application claims the same invention as Skinlo is a statement that any mandrel that "includes a tube" and is "fitted around a pin" with "the pin positioned in (the) interior of the tube" is necessarily a mandrel "for mechanically reinforcing said pin" as required by claim 1 of Skinlo. As a result, the Office Action is asserting that that any possible mandrel that "includes a tube" and is "fitted around a pin" with "the pin positioned in (the) interior of the tube" falls within the scope of the Skinlo claim language of a "mandrel closely fitted around said pin for mechanically reinforcing said pin."

Since Skinlo includes limitations that are not present in the claim 68 of the current application, claim 68 of the current application has a different scope than each of the claims in Skinlo and the rejection of claim 68 for statutory double-patenting should be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that legal error has been made by rejecting the pending claims for statutory double-patenting. For these reasons, allowance of claims 1-9, 66-71 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted



---

TRAVIS DODD

Reg. No. 42,491

Agent for Applicant(s)

Quallion LLC  
P.O. Box 923127  
Sylmar, CA 91392-3127  
818-833-2003 ph  
818-833-2065 fax  
travisd@quallion.com